now cultivating it, and has been doing so for a long time, refuses to return it, even if he is paid half of the value of the land, or only asked to give half of it to Chilola's son.

The reason for the inheritance rights of the people concerned not being clear is that twice, in the sequence of transmission, women have passed on the property, and as a result, it has left the hands of the original lineage.

Chilola's feelings are quite strong: the land belonged to her husband. Even if her mother-in-law had rights over the property at Chilola's husband's death, she was being supported by Chilola, and certainly, neither her mother-in-law's second husband nor their daughter has primacy rights against her son. (See Genealogy, Fig. 16.)

The case is obviously complicated by the fact that the property rights are defined not only in terms of inheritance rights, but in terms of usufruct (in a sense, they do not have land tenure, but milpa tenure), and the other men had been taking care of the parcel for a long time, which makes them feel that it is theirs.

This type of conflict carries over to other property, such as livestock, as exemplified in the next case.

Case 3

When Candelario Aguilar married, Juana, his wife received a regalo from her father: a bull. Candelario sold the bull and bought a cow, which had a calf.

Candelario left town and gave the cow and calf to his father Francisco, so that they would take care of it in his absence.

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 193]

159
422 During the branding of animals in the village, Francisco received
593 a letter from Candelario asking him to brand the cow and calf for
578 him. Francisco and his son, Epifanio, did so.

This started the conflict. Jose Mendez, Juana's brother, felt that the cow and calf did not rightfully belong to Candelario, nor to Francisco or Epifanio, but to him. Epifanio had a fight with Jose, and the latter, insisting on his rights, which were not very clear, stated that Candelario had sold him the cow (which was not true), when they were working in the lowlands together. Casimira, Juana and Jose's mother, supported Jose's claims over the animals, because it was the money obtained from Juana's bull that had paid for the cow that had the calf. The relatives of her daughter's husband had less right over the animal than Juana's brother.

It is possible that Jose felt that the cow and calf had been purchased with the money obtained from selling a bull which was originally his father's, not his sister's. Even if it was his sister's, he felt he had more right to use it than the sister's husband's brother and father. If owner of the bull or the cow had been a brother rather than a sister, the conflict would not have arisen. (For genealogy see Fig. 17.)

177 Third, with the introduction of Catholicism, although the
178 native belief system has preserved many of its early features,
754 it is now, without doubt, a new syncretic elaboration. The per-
796 vasive witchcraft powers are, for example, attributed now to
613 Catholic saints, but the concept that the lineage heads of principales have witchcraft power to punish deviants within their

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 195]

8: Hunt E-4,5 (1958)1962 NV9 Tzeltal NV9
Amatenango
Aguacatenango



159
422
593
578
601
602




I to IIb indicate the order in which the bull was transmitted.

IIb-IIIb indicate the order in which cow and calf were transmitted.

IV is the man that pretends to have rights over the animals, with his mother's support.

Fig. 17.--Genealogy of Candelario Aguilar